1 2

3

45

6

7 8

9

10

11

1213

141516

18

17

20

21

19

2223

2425

26

2728

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVE DALE PERCELLE,

No. C -12-05343(EDL)

Plaintiff,

ORDER RE: DKTS. 78, 90, 94, & 97

•

S. PEARSON, et al.,

Defendants.

As stated in the July 8, 2014 hearing, Plaintiff's motion to compel (Dkt. 90) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The Court DENIES Requests 1-7 and 10-13. Pursuant to Requests 8-9, the Court orders Defendant Pearson to produce to Plaintiff a redacted version of the gang validation manual designated "CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEY'S EYES ONLY."

Also as stated in the July 8, 2014 hearing, the Court orders further briefing from the Parties regarding Defendants' motion to maintain redactions (Dkts. 78, 94) in light of the Court's indication that if it were to order any further disclosures of currently redacted information, it would do so on an attorney's eyes only basis. By July 22, 2014, Plaintiff is ordered to file and serve on Defendants a declaration under seal detailing the information he alleges he knows regarding the confidential informant. By July 22, 2014, Defendants are ordered to file a letter with the Court outlining how courts have previously adjudicated requests for the names of confidential informants; Defendants should note if any Court has ordered the disclosure of the name of or other identifying information about a confidential informant subject to an attorney's eyes only protection order. Also by July 22, 2014, Defendants are ordered to file a detailed response to the objections raised in Plaintiff's May 25, 2014 letter (Dkt. 94-1 at 2-3.) As discussed and agreed to at the hearing, Defendants are further ordered to produce to Plaintiff the names of the author and reviewer of the debriefing memo

Case 3:12-cv-05343-TEH Document 106 Filed 07/10/14 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 1 2

 $designated \verb|`"CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEY'S EYES ONLY."|$

Plaintiff's administrative motion to file moving papers in excess of 25 pages (Dkt. 97) is hereby GRANTED. Henceforth, however, all parties are must comply with the requirements of Local Rule 7.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 10, 2014

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Chief Magistrate Judge